REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 6, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 19-26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wu (US 6,275,575) in view of Hogan et al. (US 5,483,587) and Culbreth et al. (US 5,953,393) further in view of Palmer et al. (US 5,546,324). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the current amendment renders the rejection moot.

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the call control engine is configured to reject the future audio conference request in response to the future audio conference lacking at least one additional future audio conference call party number for at least one participant party." None of Wu, Hogan, Culbreth and Palmer teaches or otherwise makes obvious this feature. Wu was relied upon for establishing the teleconference and teaches establishing the teleconferences in Figures 8 and 9A. These Figures and the associated description in Wu do not teach or suggest "wherein the call control engine is configured to reject the future audio conference request in response to the future audio conference lacking at least one additional future audio conference call party number for at least one participant party." Since none of Hogan, Culbreth and Palmer cures the above-identified deficiencies of Wu, the combined teaching of Wu, Hogan, Culbreth and Palmer does not teach or otherwise make obvious claim 1.

Further, claim 1 recites "wherein upon expiration of a pre-determined timer setting, indicating that the conference call is to be placed, the call control engine retrieves the future audio conference request information from the conference call database, the future audio conference request information including an entry for the conference call and a timer, the expiration of which indicating that the conference call is to be placed thereby enabling the call facility to begin placing audio connections; wherein the call control engine sets up the future audio conference upon at least one of the expiration of the timers in the timer facility,

and a polling of the conference call database to determine whether it is time to retrieve the future audio conference request information and set up the future audio conference."

By contrast, the cited section of the Office Action, that is Figure 9A, col. 10, lines 34-43, teaches "At 902 *a determination is made as to whether all the responses have been received from the selected participants or if a pre-established time limit for receipt of those responses has expired.* Upon receipt of all the responses or expiration of the pre-determined time interval, the responses are processed and the processed information is forwarded to the coordinator at 904. At 906 a determination is made as to whether the final instructions/conformation has been received from the coordinator. At 908 the coordinator *may select timed initiation 910 of the telephone conference* or manual initiation 912. At 914 the control script for the telephone conference server is generated and forwarded and the process is concluded." It can clearly be seen that Wu's time limit refers to a time during which responses to whether or not the participants wish to be included in the call and *after which* the coordinator then decides to initiate the call. In contrast, the timers in Applicant's claimed invention are set once all participants have been identified and the meeting set. The timers then expire to actually start the conference call. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Wu does not teach or otherwise make obvious claim 1. Since none of Hogan, Culbreth and Palmer cures the above-identified deficiencies of Wu, the combined teaching of Wu, Hogan, Culbreth and Palmer does not teach or otherwise make obvious claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer. Claims 19, 23, and 26 recites features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer for at least the reasons advanced with reference to Claim 1. Claims 3-8, 11 and 25 depend from Claim 1, Claims 20-22 depend upon Claim 19, Claim 24 depends upon Claim 23, and Claim 28 depends upon Claim 26, and is patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer for at least the reasons advanced with reference to Claims 1, 19, 23 and 26.

Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wu (US 6,275,575) in view of Hogan et al. (US 5,483,587), Culbreth et al. (US 5,953,393)

and Palmer et al. (US 5,546,324) further in view of Roy (US 6,697,341). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer and further in view of Roy do not teach or otherwise make obvious Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 19-26 and 28, either individually or in combination.

Roy fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu and Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer as discussed above with reference to Claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 depend from Claim 1 and are patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer in view of Roy for at least the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wu (US 6,275,575) in view of Hogan et al. (US 5,483,587), Culbreth et al. (US 5,953,393) and Palmer et al. (US5,546,324) further in view of Buskirk, Jr. (US 6,178,183). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer further in view of Buskirk, Jr. do not teach or otherwise make obvious Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 19-26 and 28, either individually or in combination.

Buskirk, Jr., fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu and Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer as discussed above with reference to Claim 26. Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 26 and are patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth and Palmer in view of Buskirk, Jr. for at least the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 26.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicant. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested. If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Customer No. 36192

Date: September 5, 2008